



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,714	12/12/2003	James R. Cole	200308963-1	2344
22879	7590	09/08/2005	EXAMINER	
<b>HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY</b> P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				HARRINGTON, ALICIA M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				2873
DATE MAILED: 09/08/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/734,714	COLE ET AL. <i>(pw)</i>	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Alicia M. Harrington	2873	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2005 and 27 June 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) 2-19 and 22-35 is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 36-38 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 0605.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement filed on 6/15/05 has been considered by the Examiner.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

2. The indicated allowability of claims 36-37 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Nakagaki et al (US 5,285,268). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 36 and 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakagaki et al (US 5,285,268).

Regarding claim 36,Nakagaki discloses a method for using a display device including a spatial modulator, comprising:

identifying an active area aspect ratio (4:3 or 9:6) or shape of an image to be projected by the display device (see col. 4, lines 60-67);  
providing a display device input signal that initiates automatic mapping (see col. 4,lines 50-67 and col. 5).

Regarding claim 37, Nakagaki discloses a display device where including a light modulation (16 or 17) comprising:

identifying an active area aspect ratio (4:3 or 9:6) or shape of an image to be projected by the display device (see col. 4, lines 60-67);  
repositioning one or more components of the display device to occlude portions of the light modulator (occlude the image size of the modulators) depending upon the active area ratio or shape (col. 5, lines 1-17).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagaki et al (US 5,285,268).

Regarding claim 38, Nakagaki discloses an apparatus for mapping image shaped for display device comprising:

An illumination source (27);

Means for selecting an image aspect ratio (see col. 4, lines 60-67)

Means for reshaping light exiting from the illumination light source depending on the image aspect ratio or shape (col. 5, lines 1-17)

Wherein the means for selecting is configured to automatically select the image aspect ratio or shape in response the video input into the display. Nakagaki improves on the prior art of user having to control the reshaping means (col.5, lines 50-67). However, it would have been an obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, that Nakagaki inventive step is an automation or replacement of a manual activity, as taught by Nakagaki; therefore the display can be utilized to control the means for reshaping by input from an user.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 2-19,22-35 are allowed.
8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Regarding claim 8, prior art taken either singularly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the dependent claims, in such manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of all the claimed features as presented in independent claims, which at least include the apparatus for mapping image shapes for a display device of claim 1, wherein the means for selecting is configured to select an image aspect ratio or shape in response to an input provided by a user of the display device.  
Regarding claim 9, prior art taken either singularly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the dependent claims, in such manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of all the claimed features as presented in independent claims, which at least include the

apparatus for mapping image shapes for a display device of claim 1, wherein the means for reshaping includes a member with a plurality of differently shaped apertures formed there through.

Regarding claim 15, prior art taken either singularly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the dependent claims, in such manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of all the claimed features as presented in independent claims, which at least include the apparatus for mapping image shapes for a display device of claim 1, wherein the means for reshaping includes a plurality of members and means for positioning the members adjacent an exit of the integrating rod depending upon the image aspect ratio or shape. Regarding claim 19, prior art taken either singularly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the dependent claims, in such manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of all the claimed features as presented in independent claims, which at least include the apparatus for mapping image shapes for a display device of claim 1, wherein the means for reshaping includes an anamorphic lens selected and positioned adjacent an exit of the integrating rod depending upon the image aspect ratio or shape.

Regarding claim 23, prior art taken either singularly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the dependent claims, in such manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of

all the claimed features as presented in independent claims, which at least include the display device of claim 20, wherein the integrating rod has a partially open entrance.

Regarding claim 27, prior art taken either singularly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the dependent claims, in such manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of all the claimed features as presented in independent claims, which at least include the display device of claim 26, wherein the one or more members include a light reflecting surface facing an exit of the integrating rod.

Regarding claim 28, prior art taken either singularly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the dependent claims, in such manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of all the claimed features as presented in independent claims, which at least include the display device of claim 26, wherein the one or more members include a light absorbing surface facing an exit of the integrating rod.

Regarding claim 29, prior art taken either singularly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the dependent claims, in such manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of all the claimed features as presented in independent claims, which at least include the display device of claim 26, wherein the variable exit aperture includes means for positioning the one or more members adjacent an exit of the integrating rod depending upon a selected image aspect ratio or shape.

Regarding claim 30, prior art taken either singularly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the dependent claims, in such manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of all the claimed features as presented in independent claims, which at least include the display device of claim 20, wherein the variable exit aperture is provided by an anamorphic lens selected and positioned adjacent an exit of the integrating rod depending upon a selected image aspect ratio or shape.

Regarding claim 33, prior art taken either singularly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the dependent claims, in such manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of all the claimed features as presented in independent claims, which at least include the display device of claim 21, wherein the means for selecting is configured to select an image aspect ratio or shape in response to an input provided by a user of the display device.

Regarding claim 34, prior art taken either singularly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the dependent claims, in such manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of all the claimed features as presented in independent claims, which at least include a method of mapping images for a display device with an integrating rod, comprising: identifying an aspect ratio or shape for an image to be projected by the display device, and positioning an object with a plurality of differently shaped and/or sized apertures

adjacent an exit of the integrating rod depending upon the aspect ratio or shape to selectively obstruct portions of the exit of the integrating rod.

Regarding claim 35, prior art taken either singularly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the dependent claims, in such manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of all the claimed features as presented in independent claims, which at least include a method of mapping images for a display device with an integrating rod, comprising: identifying an aspect ratio or shape for an image to be projected by the display device, and positioning a plurality of objects adjacent an exit of the integrating rod depending upon the aspect ratio or shape to selectively obstruct portions of the exit of the integrating rod.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Harrington whose telephone number is 571 272 2330. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Georgia Epps can be reached on 571 272 2328. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alicia M Harrington  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2873



AMH